| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | 10/587,807 | MIYATA ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | MARK L. SHEVIN | 1793 |
| Participants: Status of Application: <u>Pending first action</u> | | |
| (1) <u>MARK L. SHEVIN</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) <u>Ms. Leslie Hood</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 19 March 2009 | Time: <u>3:45 PM</u> | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: N/A | | |
| Claims discussed: 6-10 and 16-20 | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: Ms. Hood confirmed that the amendments to claims 6-10 (claims 16-20 dependent) should read "line pipe" instead of "live pipe". | | |
| Part III. | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| /Mark L. Shevin/ | | |
| (A | pplicant/Applicant's Representati | ive Signature – if appropriate) |